

# MEDICAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

## PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION

<b>Type of Requestor:</b> (x) HCP ( ) IE ( ) IC	<b>Response Timely Filed?</b> (x) Yes ( ) No
Requestor's Name and Address Vista Medical Center Hospital 4301 Vista Rd. Pasadena, TX 77503	MDR Tracking No.: M4-03-5547-01
	TWCC No.:
	Injured Employee's Name:
Respondent's Name and Address Continental Casualty Co. c/o Burns, Anderson, Jury & Brenner Box 47	Date of Injury:
	Employer's Name: Nabors Drilling USA Inc.
	Insurance Carrier's No.: 010929003070WC01

## PART II: SUMMARY OF DISPUTE AND FINDINGS

Dates of Service		CPT Code(s) or Description	Amount in Dispute	Amount Due
From	To			
05/20/02	06/03/02	Inpatient Hospitalization	\$2,643.78	\$0.00

## PART III: REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Position Summary states in part, "...TWCC Rule 134.401 provides the rules regarding reimbursement for Acute Care In-patient Hospital Fee services. Specifically, reimbursement consists of 75% of remaining charges for the entire admission, after a carrier audits a bill... This figure is presumptively considered to be 'fair and reasonable' in accordance with the preamble of TWCC Rule 134... Further, the TWCC stated that the stop-loss threshold increases hospital reimbursement and will ensure fair and reasonable rates for hospitals and ensure access to quality health care for injured workers..."

## PART IV: RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Position Summary was not submitted by the Respondent.

## PART V: MEDICAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION REVIEW SUMMARY, METHODOLOGY, AND/OR EXPLANATION

This dispute relates to inpatient services provided in hospital setting with reimbursement subject to the provisions of Rule 134.401 (Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline). The hospital has requested reimbursement according to the stop-loss method contained in that rule. Rule 134.401(c)(6) establishes that the stop-loss method is to be used for "unusually costly services." The explanation that follows this paragraph indicates that in order to determine if "unusually costly services" were provided, the admission must not only exceed \$40,000 in total audited charges, but also involve "unusually extensive services."

After reviewing the documentation provided by both parties, it does **not** appear that this particular admission involved "unusually extensive services." Accordingly, the stop-loss method does not apply and the reimbursement is to be based on the per diem plus carve-out methodology described in the same rule.

The total length of stay for this admission was 14 days (consisting of 14 days for surgical). Accordingly, the standard per diem amount due for this admission is equal to \$15,652.00 (14 times \$1,118). In addition, the hospital is entitled to additional reimbursement for (implantables/MRIs/CAT Scans/pharmaceuticals) as follows: Per Rule 134.401(4)(C) pharmaceuticals administered during the admission and greater than \$250 charged per dose shall be reimbursed at cost plus 10%. The Requestor did not submit invoices for those pharmaceuticals; therefore, cost plus 10% could not be determined by MDR.

The Table of Disputed Services submitted with the Request for Dispute Resolution lists the amount billed as \$137,145.33; however, the UB-92, submitted with the Request has a total charge of \$70,050.10. The insurance carrier made an initial payment of \$50,010.88 leaving a balance of \$20,039.31. The Requestor submitted an updated table on May 13, 2003 listing the amount billed as \$23,450.54 with the amount paid being \$14,944.13 and the amount in dispute being \$2,643.78. If the Stop-loss method was actually applied to the total charge of \$70,050.10, 75% of the amount billed should have been \$52,537.58. According to EOB's and the tables of disputed services submitted the total amount of payments were \$64,955.01 (\$50,010.88 + \$14,944.13).

Considering the reimbursement amount calculated in accordance with the provisions of rule 134.401(c) compared with the amount previously paid by the insurance carrier, we find that no additional reimbursement is due for these services.

**PART VI: COMMISSION DECISION**

Based upon the review of the disputed healthcare services, the Medical Review Division has determined that the requestor is **not** entitled to additional reimbursement.

Findings and Decision by:

Marguerite Foster

03/15/05

Authorized Signature

Typed Name

Date of Order

**PART VII: YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST A HEARING**

Either party to this medical dispute may disagree with all or part of the Decision and has a right to request a hearing. A request for a hearing must be in writing and it must be received by the TWCC Chief Clerk of Proceedings/Appeals Clerk within 20 (twenty) days of your receipt of this decision (28 Texas Administrative Code § 148.3). This Decision was mailed to the health care provider and placed in the Austin Representatives box on \_\_\_\_\_. This Decision is deemed received by you five days after it was mailed and the first working day after the date the Decision was placed in the Austin Representative's box (28 Texas Administrative Code § 102.5(d)). A request for a hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings/Appeals Clerk, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744 or faxed to (512) 804-4011. A copy of this Decision should be attached to the request.

The party appealing the Division's Decision shall deliver a copy of their written request for a hearing to the opposing party involved in the dispute.

**Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.**

**PART VIII: INSURANCE CARRIER DELIVERY CERTIFICATION**

I hereby verify that I received a copy of this Decision in the Austin Representative's box.

Signature of Insurance Carrier: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_